



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/571,279	12/26/2006	Keiko Takahashi	1056-0133PUS1	6051
2292 7590 07/09/2009 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				
EXAMINER LOEWE, SUN JAE Y				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1626				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/09/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/571,279

Applicant(s)

TAKAHASHI ET AL.

Examiner

SUN JAE Y. LOEWE

Art Unit

1626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claim 23 is pending in the instant application.

Response to Amendment/Arguments

2. The amendments/arguments filed on June 1, 2009 have been fully considered. The 35 USC 112 1st paragraph rejections have been obviated and are thus hereby withdrawn. The 35 USC 112 2nd paragraph rejection is maintained. Applicant's arguments have been considered, however, they are not found to be persuasive. One of ordinary skill would not be apprised as to how the term "substantially" limits the instant claims. Thus, it would not be understood whether solid forms disclosed in the prior art for the instant chemical compound, which also display XRD pattern, would fit into the scope of the instant claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claim 23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over WO2000005395 (pg. 26).

The reference teaches a solid form of the claimed compound, which is further recrystallized from ethanol/n-hexane. The reference does not teach parameters which define the solid form (eg. XRD pattern). Thus, the difference between the prior art polymorph and the

instantly claimed form lies on characteristics for which the reference happens to be silent. This is not an ordinary inherency situation, however, as stated in *Ex parte Anderson*, 21 USPQ 2nd 1241 and 1251 “There is ample precedent for shifting the burden to an applicant to reproduce a prior art product whose final structure or properties are, at least, in part determined by the precise process used in its manufacture.” (page 1253). Furthermore, MPEP 2112.V states that “once a reference teaching product appearing to be substantially identical is made the basis of a rejection, and the examiner presents evidence or reasoning tending to show inherency, the burden shifts to the applicant to show an unobvious difference.

To overcome this rejection, Applicant is requested to provide a showing of how the instantly claimed crystalline form is different (or unobvious) from the solid form disclosed by the reference.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re*

Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claim 23 rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3, 8-11 and 13-20 of US 6,469,043. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other for the reasons below.

Determination of the scope and contents of claims 1-3, 8-11 and 13-20 of US 6,469,043.
The claims are drawn to a Markush group of compounds which include the instantly named species. The instant species is a preferred embodiment.

Ascertaining the differences between claims 1-3, 8-11 and 13-20 of US 6,469,043.
US 6,469,043 teaches a solid form(s) of the instantly claimed compound. However, the reference does not teach a specific crystalline form because the inherent feature that defines such form (eg. XRD data) is not disclosed. Thus, the difference between the form in US 6,469,043 and the instantly claimed crystalline form lies on characteristics (XRD pattern) for which US 6,469,043 is silent. This is not an ordinary inherency situation, however, as stated in *Ex parte Anderson*, 21 USPQ 2nd 1241 and 1251 "There is ample precedent for shifting the burden to an applicant to reproduce a prior art product whose final structure or properties are, at least, in part determined by the precise process used in its manufacture." (page 1253). Furthermore, MPEP 2112.V states that "once a reference teaching product appearing to be substantially identical is made the basis of a rejection, and the examiner presents evidence or reasoning tending to show inherency, the burden shifts to the applicant to show an unobvious difference."

Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art – Prima Facie Case of Obviousness.

MPEP § 2144.08.II.A.4(c) states “...consider teachings of a preferred species within the genus. If such a species is structurally similar to that claimed, its disclosure may motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to choose the claimed species or subgenus from the genus, based on the reasonable expectation that structurally similar species usually have similar properties”. This is a “Genus-Species Guidelines” for the examination based on 35 U.S.C. 103. An analogous guideline was followed here for the analysis of obviousness-type double patenting.

The preferred embodiment suggest to one of ordinary skill to make a solid form of the instantly claimed chemical species. If the form is the same as that instantly claimed, the instant claims are *prima facie* obvious over claims 1-3, 8-11 and 13-20 of US 6,469,043.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUN JAE Y. LOEWE whose telephone number is (571)272-9074. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00 Est.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph McKane can be reached on (571)272-0699. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sun Jae Y. Loewe/
7-2-2009

/Joseph K. McKane/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1626